

Application No.: 10/007,502
Amendment dated: July 1, 2004
Reply to Office Action of April 1, 2004

b.) Remarks

Claims 1-16 are pending in this application. Claim 1 has been amended in various particulars. New Claim 16 has been added to alternatively define Applicant's invention.

The only outstanding issue is the rejection of the claims based on prior art references. Specifically, Claims 1-9 and 11-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,524,127 to Kane in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,824,236 to Hawkins, *et al.* In a related rejection, claim 10 was further rejected over the Kane and Hawkins, *et al.* patents in further view of U.S. Patent No. 4,451,119 to Meyers, *et al.* These rejections are respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Independent claims 1 and 15 are directed to a combination of features including forming topographic features on an optical element substrate, mechanically polishing the surface of the substrate, and then dicing the substrate into separate optical elements.

This method is neither shown nor suggested by the applied references. Specifically, neither the Kane nor Hawkins, *et al.* patents teaches that the substrate should be diced into separate optical elements after the claimed formation and polishing steps. This conclusion is further buttressed by the fact that the Kane patent is directed toward making a lens array.

The pending Office Action argues that the Kane patent suggests to dice the lenses at column 1, lines 34-35, of the patent. This section, however, merely states that lens arrays have been made by cutting with a diamond tool. Apparently, this reference is directed to a diamond scribing process possibly for forming the curved optical surfaces. Of relevance here, however, is the fact that this portion of the reference does not suggest to dice the substrate into separate optical elements as claimed.

Applicant further points out that new claim 16 is directed to producing a concave optical surfaces which are additionally coated to be reflective. In contrast, both the Kane

Application No.: 10/007,502
Amendment dated: July 1, 2004
Reply to Office Action of April 1, 2004

and Hawkins, *et al.* patents are directed to producing convex optical surfaces working in transmission.

The additionally cited Meyers, *et al.* patent fails to rectify the previously above-noted deficiencies in the primary and secondary reference.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant therefore believes that the present rejection should be withdrawn.

Applicant believes that the present application is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited. Should any questions arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

AXSUN TECHNOLOGIES, INC.

By 

J. Grant Houston, Esq.

Registration No. 35,900

Tel.: (978) 262-0049

Fax: (978) 262-0035

Billerica, Massachusetts 01821
Date: July 1, 2004